

APULEIUS *METAMORPHOSES* 1, 1, 5 *FORENSIS*: 'FOREIGN' OR 'OF THE FORUM'?

Denis V. Keyer

St. Petersburg Institute of History, RAS,
7, Petrozavodskaya ul., St. Petersburg, 197110, Russian Federation; keyer@mail.ru
St. Petersburg State University,
7-9, Universitetskaya nab., St. Petersburg, Russian Federation; d.keyer@spbu.ru

In Apul. *Met.* 1, 1, 5 *exotici ac forensi<s> sermonis* the word *forensis* means 'foreign' and not 'belonging to the forum'. The former is required by the context: two coordinate adjectives linked with *ac* should convey a sense of similarity. The arguments raised against it are unfounded: (1) elsewhere in Apuleius the word refers to the forum — but in *Met.* 4, 13, 6 *forensis* was convincingly defended in the sense of 'foreign' by Armini; (2) the meaning 'foreign' is not attested until the end of the 4th century, i.e. 200 years after Apuleius — but a number of lexical units that first occur in the *Metamorphoses* are attested later only from the 4th century on; (3) its derivation from *foris* suggests a vulgar colloquialism — but the word was used in the sense of 'being out of doors' by Colum. XII praef. 4. Recent attempts to explain the word in both meanings at once are implausible: the idea of 'the style of the Roman forum' (from which the narrator deviates) is far-fetched, and it seems impossible to cram this sense into the perfectly clear pair of synonyms 'coming from abroad and foreign'. Refs 45.

Keywords: Apuleius, *Metamorphoses*, prologue, late Latin, *forensis*.

1. Introduction

The prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (1, 1) uses a bizarre lexicon rich in connotations and overtones: almost every word eccentric, almost every sentence posing textual and interpretational problems. The substantial contrast between the 325 pages of the Oxford Companion to the prologue (Kahane/Laird 2001), and the size of the prologue itself, has not been met without irony, but in this case, the size of the Companion, as well as other scholarly research, is entirely justified.

One of the problems with the prologue is the meaning of *sermo forensis*. Lucius, the Greek-speaking narrator of the Latin version of the novel appears to apologize for his poor command of Latin — it is unclear whether this implies linguistic blunders or, as some scholars insist, merely ungainly style¹ (*Met.* 1, 1, 5–6):

mox in urbe Latia advena studiorum Quiritium indigenam sermonem aerumnabili labore, nullo magistro praeunte, aggressus excolui. en ecce praefamur veniam, siquid exotici ac

¹ Korenjak 1997, 328–332 argues that perfect knowledge implied by *excolui* rules out apologizing for linguistic errors in the next sentence. In his opinion, the sentence starting with *en ecce* refers not to foreign language, but to alien and unaccustomed literary style and introduces a new thought that is linked not with the mention of Latin in the preceding, but with *immutatio vocis* in the following sentence. However, the sense of perfection in *excolui* need not be overstressed, and it seems an exaggeration to maintain that it contradicts the following topos of modesty (for parallel examples see Dowden 2001, 129–132, with literature). Besides, one can hardly deprive *exoticus* of the idea of 'foreign' (ibid. 330 with n. 9 "fremdartig anmutend"; he refers to the examples from *ThLL* V 2, 1596, 55–61 "i.q. inconveniens", but they do retain the idea of 'foreign, coming from overseas').

forensi<s> sermonis rudis locutor offendero. iam haec equidem ipsa vocis immutatio desultoriae scientiae stilo quem accessimus respondet: fabulam Graecanicam incipimus...

exotici F exotici <...> Sittl, exotici <sonuero> van der Vliet, exotici <dixero> Nisbet, exoticus Harrison

forensi F forensis φ ac forensi del. Leo

offendero F, ostendero Nisbet accessimus F, accersimus ed. Ven. 1493, arcessimus Wower

respondit F, respondet de Buxis

“Soon afterwards, in the city of the Latins, as a newcomer to Roman studies I attacked and cultivated their native speech with laborious difficulty and no teacher to guide me. So, please, I beg your pardon in advance if, as a raw² speaker of this foreign tongue of the Forum [or rather imported and foreign tongue? — DK], I commit any blunders. Now in fact this very changing of language [or register?] corresponds to the type of writing we have sought out,³ which is like the knowledge of a rider jumping from one horse to another...” (Transl. Tilg 2014, 21)

Quiritium can depend either on *studiorum* or on *sermonum*. I prefer the former, since *studiorum* taken without the adnominal genitive has a less clear meaning than *indigenam sermonem*; if we take *advena studiorum* without the following *Quiritium*, it would mean that the speaker is a novice to any form of study, but the previous sentence seems to imply the studying of Greek literature.

Forensis instead of *forensi* in the following sentence, a slight and early correction of the text, is accepted by most of the editors: other solutions are less plausible paleographically. If we accept this (which seems justified), we must decide whether *forensis sermonis* is to be taken with *si quid*⁴ or with *locutor*. The first would seem more natural, but Nisbet 2001, 24 finds that the colon *quid ... offendero* would then be too long (21 syllables). Attempts to avoid this difficulty lead to a more radical intervention into the text: (a) supplying a verb after *exotici*;⁵ (b) deleting *ac forensi* as a gloss;⁶ (b) changing *exotici* to *exoticus*.⁷ I believe that the simplest solution is to accept the length of the colon *si quid ... offendero* and to take *exotici ac forensis sermonis* apo koinou with *si quid* and *locutor*.

The following sentence is much debated, for the implications of “changing of voice” and “equestrian vaulting”, and the point of comparison between the two are far from self-evident. I shall not discuss these in detail in this article; suffice to say that *haec ipsa vocis immutatio* has been interpreted to refer to (a) the changing of language (from Greek

² Tilg 2007, 173–175 insists that *rudis locutor* is not ‘inexperienced speaker’ (as it is usually taken), but ‘rough talker’. Korenjak 1997, 331 n. 12 suggests ‘unfamiliar’ citing OLD s.v. 7 and Met. 1, 3, 3 *visu rudia*. I would prefer ‘inexperienced’ (Dowden 2001, 130 cites Tac. Agr. 3, 3 *incondita ac rudi voce*), but it is not crucial to the meaning of *sermo forensis*. The popular suggestion by Winkler 1985, 196–197 that *rudis* hints at *rudere* (braying of an ass) is rightly objected to by Nisbet 2001, 24 and Tilg 2007, 174 n. 36. From Gell. 1, 15, 1 *leves et futiles et inopportuni locutores* it is clear that *locutor* is pointedly negative.

³ Tilg adopts the early emendation *accersimus*; tempting as it might seem, *accedere stilum* may be retained (cf. Keulen 2007b, 89–90).

⁴ Thus, e.g., Nisbet 2001, 24 (but he breaks the colon with <dixero>).

⁵ Van der Vliet 1897a, 1–2; 1897b, 81; Nisbet 2001, 24. The latter also suggests *offendero* instead of *ostendero*, as he finds it untactful that Lucius calles Latin ‘outlandish’. Powell 2001, 31 n. 10 rightly objects that *exoticus* did not necessarily have the same disparaging nuance as ‘outlandish’ in English. It is noteworthy that in the preceding sentence Latin is, on the contrary, called *indigena sermo*, however Tilg 2007, 169–170 rightly maintains that “the Greek speaker ... switches his viewpoint”.

⁶ Leo 1905, 606; contra Helm 1907 (²1913, ³1931=1955), 1–2 in apparatus.

⁷ Harrison/Winterbottom 2001, 14; Harrison admits that *exoticus* is not found as referring to people until the 6th century and suggests the idea (to my mind, implausible) that the speaker of the Prologue is the book itself (in detail: Harrison 1990, 507–513).

into Latin); (b) the changing of register of voice (interpreted as a distortion of the language or style); and *desultoria scientia* to (a) translation of Greek text into Latin; (b) narration about sudden changes of Fortune; (c) inserted tales; (d) magical metamorphoses.

Our main concern is the phrase *exoticus ac forensis sermo*. *Exoticus* is a rare word with an archaic feel, usually applied to merchandise ('imported, from overseas'). *Forensis* has been interpreted in three ways:

- (1) as 'referring to the forum' (different implications of the forum have been implied by different scholars);⁸
- (2) as 'foreign' (allegedly derived from the adverb *foris* or *foras*);⁹
- (3) as an intentional ambiguity based on both meanings.¹⁰

Since the middle of the last century, most scholars tend to assume that here *sermo forensis* refers to the forum, but interpret this reference differently. The forum may be understood either as simply a substitute for Rome (a kind of *pars pro toto*, 'of the (Roman) forum' being the same as simply 'Roman'); or as a reference to rhetoric (as if Lucius were addressing his audience from a rostrum); or else, as the centre of Roman literary life more generally. This latter possibility impels some scholars to polarize between restrained Roman and frivolously over-embellished Greek manner of eloquence, for which the narrator allegedly apologizes. *Forensis* is thus taken in its usual meaning, 'of the forum',¹¹ but charged with connotations that are not obvious from the immediate context. Having come to this conclusion, few scholars go on to defend this interpretation at length.¹²

In contrast, articles by Dubuisson 2000 and Powell 2001 that focus on the meaning of *forensis* in the prologue, interpret the word as 'foreign'. Reasonably enough, they argue that this meaning fits the immediate context perfectly (for coordinate synonyms in Apuleius, Dubuisson cites *Met.* 3, 8, 1 *lacrimosus et flebilis* and 7, 2, 4 *veteris priscaeque*¹³). 'Belonging to the forum' would be a strange coordinate pair for *exoticus*, and the connection of

⁸ Sittl 1889, 558–559; Helm 1907 (²1913, ³1931=1955), 1–2; Molt 1938, 27; Harrauer/Römer 1985, 356 n. 18; 359; Fick-Michel 1991, 84–85; 353–354; 415 (non vidi); Harrison/Winterbottom 2001, 14; Nisbet 2001, 24 (cf. n. 5 above); May 2013, 46 ("mistranslating ... as 'foreignness'"); 98. In translations of the prologue: Valette 1940, 6; Helm ²1956, 29; Hanson 1989, 5; Kenney 1990, 7; etc. Cf. Korenjak 1997, 329–330 with n. 7: "*Exotici ac forensis sermonis* wird bereits – wenn auch in höchst eigenwilliger Art und Weise – auf die Sprache des Romans, nicht mehr aufs Lateinische allgemein bezogen".

⁹ Rönsch 1875, 339 with n. 7; Van der Vliet 1897b, 81 (but in his reconstruction *forensis* is not coordinate with *exoticus*, see n. 5 above); Augello 1980 ad loc.; defended at length by Dubuisson 2000, Powell 2001. Korenjak 1997, 330–331 with n. 10 derives *forensis* from *foris*, but translates it as "ungewöhnlich" instead of "foreign" (cf. n. 1 above on his interpretation of *exoticus*). In translations: Adlington/Gaselee, 1915, 2; Grimal 1958, 145; Münstermann 1995, 57.

¹⁰ Tilg 2007, 169–172; 2014, 32–35; Keulen 2007b, 9; 85.

¹¹ Remarkable is the interpretation of Scobie 1975, 74: 'foreign and reminiscent of the market-place'; likely, he takes *exotici ac forensis sermonis* with *locutor* and not with *si quid*. Likewise Winkler 1985, 181 "...if I happen to hit on any exotic or ... bazaar language..." (Nisbet 2001, 24 rightly objects to rendering *offendere* as "hit on").

¹² Harrison/Winterbottom 2001, 14. Tilg 2007, 169–172; 2014, 32–35 and Keulen 2007b, 85, though accepting the meaning 'foreign', insist that the meaning 'of the forum' is also present; they elaborate a complicated conception of the 'language of the forum', in order to explain the implications of the following sentence. On the problems of this approach, see below, § 5.

¹³ Dubuisson 2000, 609 n. 12, with further reference to Bernhard 1927, 164–170. He rightly states that examples cited in Helm's apparatus (*solitum ac naturale, mutilus ac putris, pigre ac timide*) are not close synonyms, but Helm interpreted the word as 'quo in foro utuntur' and his aim was to object to Leo who deleted *ac forensi* as a gloss (see n. 6 above); he was therefore more interested in combinations with *ac*.

Latin language to the forum remains unclear from the context. That is, if the meaning ‘foreign’ is conceivable in Apuleius at all, then it is preferable to the usual interpretation ‘of the forum’, whatever implications the latter might suggest. The question is, whether Apuleius could have used the word in this unusual meaning.

On the whole, three arguments have been put forward against the interpretation of *forensis* as ‘foreign’ in this passage:

1. In other instances, Apuleius uses *forensis* to mean ‘of the forum’, deriving it from *forum* (not from *foris* / *foras*).¹⁴

2. Judging by *ThLL* s.v. (F. Vollmer), with the exception of the passage in question and two other obscure passages,¹⁵ the word only begins to be translated as ‘foreign’ from the end of the 4th century AD, starting with Ambrose.¹⁶ This two century gap between the original text and the earliest interpretations of the word as ‘foreign’, suggests that during Apuleius’ lifetime, this use of the word in this way either did not exist, or else was too vulgar for his elaborate prologue.

3. A third argument, while not stated expressis verbis, exists: it seems likely that those who refuse to take *forensis* in *Met.* 1, 1, 5 in the sense of ‘foreign’ are not comfortable with the way it has been derived. It is hard to believe that eloquent speakers of classical Latin could derive *forensis* from *foris* or *foras*; this morphological inconsistency seems a vulgar colloquialism far beyond Apuleius.

Now let us examine these arguments one at a time.

2. *Forensis* in Apuleius

The principle “Apuleium ex Apuleio” need not be observed as strictly as “Homerum ex Homero”. Even if in the other four cases in the “Metamorphoses”, and one other in the “Apology”, *forensis* is used to signify the forum (see n. 14 above), this does not necessarily exclude the possibility of another interpretation of the word in the prologue. Crucial to the discussion, however, is another passage (*Met.* 4, 13, 16):

qui praeterea numerus, quae facies ferarum! nam praecipuo studio forensis etiam advexerat(,) generosa illa damnatorum capitum funera.

forensis F, *def. Armini* (scil. *feras*); *forinsecus Heinsius*, *foris Kronenberg*, *forensi* (scil. *studio*) *plerique*

“Further more, what a number of beasts there were, how many species! For he had taken particular care to import exotic animals too — fine¹⁷ coffins, those, for condemned criminals.” (transl. Hijmans a.o. 1977, 107–108).

¹⁴ *Apol.* 66, 18 *forensis operae*; *Met.* 9, 6, 1 *forensi negotio*; 10, 33, 1 *forensia pecora*; 11, 28, 6 *quaesticulo forensi*; 30, 2 *stipendiis forensibus*.

¹⁵ The one is Apul. *Met.* 4, 13, 6 on which see below, § 2. The other is Plin. *NH* 14, 42 *et quae forenses vocantur* (scil. *uvae* — DK), *celeris proventu, vendibiles aspectu, portatu faciles*; if the text is sound, it might be explained as ‘designed for the forum’. Vollmer (*ThLL*, s.v.) takes it in the sense of ‘foreign’ (thus Ernout/Meillet³ 1951, 444 s.v. *forum*, see n. 18 below), but with reservation (‘nisi foro destinatas’).

¹⁶ Ambros. *Hexaameron* 3, 3, 13 *quidam de scriptoribus forensibus*; Hegesipp. 5, 5 *ubi forense proelium* (Ioseph. *Bell. Iud.* 5, 3, 1 τοῦ θύραθεν πολέμου) *paulisper quievit, internum successit*; Ps. Aug. *Quaest. vet. et novi testam.* 100 *minime ... litteris forensibus eruditi*; Greg. M. *Epist.* 1, 72 *forensibus bellis* (opp. *ecclesiastica proelia*); 6, 13 *forensem presbyterum*.

¹⁷ I would prefer ‘distinguished’ or ‘noble coffins’, so as to suggest the meaning ‘of good breeding’.

Editors usually consider *forensis* to have been corrupted here, and change it to *forinsecus* or *foris*. Yet the manuscript reading was ingeniously defended by Armini 1932, 74–75, where he interpreted *forensis* as Acc. plur. of an adjective without a noun (*feras* might easily be supplemented from *ferarum* in the end of the previous sentence). *Funera* would then be in apposition to *forensis* (scil. *feras*), the comma coming after *advexerat*. The slight discomfort of this apposition (different gender of *forensis* *feras* and *funera*) is not wholly unacceptable.

Armini's interpretation was supported in the Groningen Commentaries (Hijmans a.o. 1977, 107–108; Keulen 2007b, 85) and in the recent Oxford edition of Zimmermann, 2012, 80. If we accept it (which is indeed very tempting), all doubts over the possibility of *forensis* meaning 'foreign' in the prologue automatically fall away. Let us, however, leave this question open and admit the possibility that *forensis* in *Met.* 4, 13, 6 is corrupt.

3. *Forensis* — 'external' before Apuleius?

It must be admitted that, before Apuleius, *forensis* had never yet been used to mean 'foreign', but it does not follow that its alternative derivation from *foris* or *foras* did not exist before Apuleius. It is worth examining how this problem has been handled by lexicographers. The main dictionaries show a remarkable discrepancy over the different possible meanings of *forensis*. On the one hand, *OLD* s.v. cites *Met.* 1, 1, 5 as the only instance of *forensis* as 'external', derived from *foris* or *foras* (it does not take into account later examples from the 4th century). On the other hand, an entry by F. Vollmer in the *ThLL* cites a great number of passages in which *forensis* is allegedly derived from *foris*, *foras*. The section "2. *forensis*, -e [*a foris*, *foras*]", includes approximately 20 passages from Cicero where *forensis* is opposed to *domesticus* (in all of them *domesticus* is mentioned in the text) under the heading 'opp. *domesticus*' (subsection 1);¹⁸ the subsection with numerous examples on *vestis forensis* (Liv. 33, 47, 10; Colum. 12, 47, 5; etc.) or *forensia* (Petron. 56, 9; Suet. Aug. 73) is also placed under the section "2. *forensis*, -e [*a foris*, *foras*]"¹⁹.

These variations among lexicographers are relevant for the third argument against *forensis* as 'foreign'. While others wonder if *forensis* could be derived from *foris* by Apuleius, Vollmer's entry in the *ThLL* presents this derivation as Ciceronian: if so, far from a vulgar colloquialism, *forensis* in the sense of 'foreign' would be simply a modification of a classical usage (once a house is compared with a city or a state, 'external' becomes the same as 'foreign'). Yet it seems that Vollmer's method in distinguishing between the two meanings of *forensis* is somewhat inaccurate and *OLD* is right in deriving *vestis forensis* (*forense*) and most of the Ciceronian exempla, in which *forensis* is contrasted with *domesticus*, from *forum* rather than *foris*. In all Ciceronian passages from Vollmer's subsection 1 and the whole subsection on *vestis forensis* the meaning 'external' can be linked with *forum* as a public place. It is clothing worn in public and public activities that are opposed to

¹⁸ This subsection is implemented by the obscure passage from Varro *Men.* 349 (see n. 21 below) and Colum. 12 praef. 4; 7; 8, on which see below. Subsection 2 ('opp. *indigena*, *patrius* sim.') includes Plin. *NH* 14, 42 (see n. 15 above), Apul. *Met.* 1, 1, 5 and late examples listed above in n. 16. Subsection 3 ('opp. *internus* sim., de animo') includes only late examples from Ambrose on. Ernout/Meillet 31951, 444 s.v. *forum* also date the derivation from *foris* back to classical Latin: "Mais, d'assez bonne heure, peut-être déjà dans Varr. et Cic., *forensis*, faussement rapproché de *foras*, *foris*, et opposé à *domesticus*, a pris le sens de 'étranger, extérieur', e.g. *forenses vites*, Plin. 14, 42."

¹⁹ Forcellini s.v. also considers examples of *vestis forensis* and *forensia* to be derived from *foris*.

domestic ones.²⁰ Of course, it does not exclude the possibility of a paretymological influence of *foris* / *foras* on the usage of *forensis*, but nevertheless every case where the sense of ‘public’ is perceptible should be clearly identified as the usual *forensis* derived from *forum*. Semantic opposition to *domesticus* hardly suffices to classify these cases of *forensis* as another word with the meaning ‘external, outdoor’.

However, even if we lay aside all Ciceronian examples and those on *vestis forensis* (*forense*), at least one passage²¹ contains an example when the meaning ‘external’ clearly dominates, while the sense of ‘public’ is totally absent (Colum. 12 *praef.* 4–8, based on Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* 7, 18 sqq. and young Cicero’s translation):²²

Quare cum ... nec exigua cura foris acquirerentur, quae domi custodiri oporteret, iure, ut dixi, natura comparata est [opera] mulieris ad domesticam diligentiam, viri autem ad exercitationem forensem et extraneam... (7) ...domesticus labor matronalis fuit, tamquam ad requiem forensium exercitationum, omni cura deposita, patribus familias intra domesticos penatis se recipientibus... (8) ...in commune conspirabatur ab utroque, ut cum forensibus negotiis matronalis industria rationem parem faceret.
(Cf. 2 domi sub tecto / foris et sub divo, 5–6 domestica negotia / foris et in aperto, apud Xen. ἔξω / ἔνδον)

“Wherefore, since ... and since the acquisition of those things which have to be safeguarded at home calls for no small amount of attention out of doors, it is only right, as I have said, that the female sex has been provided for the care of the home, the male for out-of-doors and open-air activities... (7) ...domestic labour was practically the sphere of the married woman, the fathers of families betaking themselves to the family fireside, all care laid aside, only to rest from their public [or rather out-of-doors — DK] activities... (8) ...but both conspired for the common advantage, so that the wife’s diligence at home vied with the husband’s public [or rather out-of-doors — DK] activities.” (Transl. Forster/Heffner ²1968, 177; 179).

Pace *OLD* s.v., it seems wrong to state that here *forensis* means ‘public’ (even though it is opposed to domestic). The activities in question are agriculture, navigation, market business, military service,²³ and all are consistently said to be carried out *foris* and *sub divo*. The idea of public eye or public interest is absent from this context. The author, be it Columella or young Cicero, clearly used this word in the same sense as ‘extraneus’, as rightly observed by Rönsch 1875, 339, n. 5 and Dubuisson 2000, 611 with n. 28.²⁴

Aside from paretymological associations with *foris* or *foras*, *forensis* as ‘external’, can be explained in another way as yet unnoticed by scholars: it may be a semantique calque from Greek θυραῖος and thus a normal derivative from *fores*, in the same way that θυραῖος

²⁰ Thus Rönsch 1875, 339 n. 7, referring to Dio Cass. 48, 4, 5: ἐν τῇ ἀγοραίῳ στολῇ.

²¹ Little can be said with certainty on Varro *Men.* 349 (cf. n. 18 above) *si quis ἡμελοδινιστῆ ὄνος λύρας, praesepebus se retineat forensibus* (‘alienus’ Vollmer s.v.), but often it is taken to refer to the forum (Shanzer 1986, 39 “forensic manger”).

²² Quoted from Hedberg 1968, 13–14; he spaces the text that follows the words *quod etiam Cicero ait* (12 *praef.* 1) up to the end of *praef.* 6 as a direct quotation from Cicero.

²³ *Praef.* 1 *rusticari ... navigare ... negotiari*; 4 *rusticationis et militarium stipendiorum*.

²⁴ NB! The text of Dubuisson should be corrected: in the main text on p. 611 “Plin l’Ancien” and “Plin” should be replaced with “Columelle” (3 times) and the reference in n. 28 must read “Colum. XII *Praef.* 4”. Apart from Vollmer’s entry in the *ThLL*, *forensis* in the passage in question is derived from *foris* by Forcellini s.v.

is derived from θῦραι.²⁵ One might object that θυραῖος is not a common word — it was popular in tragedy and since Plutarch has occasionally been observed in philosophical contexts. However this has been very similar to examples of *forensis* cited by Vollmer in his 3rd subsection of *forensis* as derived from *foris* (“opp. *internus* sim., de animo”, beginning also with Ambrose).²⁶

Whether *forensis* acquired the meaning ‘external’ by analogy with *foris* / *foras* or with Greek θυραῖος, the third argument against *forensis* = ‘foreign’ in the prologue is thereby disposed of: the same derivation, odd as it might seem, was used by Columella (if not Cicero himself).

4. The vocabulary of late Latin in Apuleius’ “Metamorphoses”

Now we shall examine the second of the three arguments: however slight the semantic development might be from ‘external’ to ‘foreign’, the latter interpretation has not been seen beyond Apuleius any earlier than the end of the 4th century BC (see n. 16 above). Many scholars, even those who eventually interpret *forensis* in *Met.* 1, 1, 5 as ‘foreign’, find this a difficult gap to bridge.²⁷ Unlike other aspects of the problem discussed, the question of how typical “voces infimae Latinitatis” are in the “Metamorphoses” lexicon, seems to remain in the background. However, this merits discussion. If the first use of certain lexical phrases after the “Metamorphoses” do not, or only very seldom occur until a full two centuries later, we must be suspicious of the interpretation of *forensis* as ‘foreign’ in the prologue. If, on the contrary, there is sure and common evidence of this, we may lose all doubt.

As a preliminary objection to this argument one might remember an old joke about a camel, who, when asked why his neck is so crooked, grinned sadly and said: ‘Do I have anything straight?’ Apuleius’ eccentric vocabulary is known to abound with *hapax legomena* that do not appear after him at all, not just two centuries later.²⁸ With this in mind, the significant gap in the use of *forensis* to mean ‘foreign’ appears less worrisome. In any way, the *ThLL* has reached the letter R (with the omission of N), so this important question can be clarified with certainty.

Admittedly, I did not have the patience to compare the entire “Index Apuleianus” (Oldfather a.o. 1934) with the *ThLL*, productive as that might have been. Instead, I used Rönsch’s “Itala und Vulgata” (Rönsch 1875) as a stepping stone, as it pays close attention to Apuleian vocabulary. Searching within the pdf-document I noted down about 240 alleg-

²⁵ *Fores* and θῦραι are attested as equivalents in Greek-Latin glosses: see *CGL* VI, 462; VII, 542 (index). My colleague Evgeny Filimonov insightfully suggests that *forensis* might be derived from the native *foris* (cf. *circensis*, *atriensis*, *canaliensis*, *lutensis*) and its similarity to θυραῖος might be explained as a parallel semantic development rather than a calque (cf. *foras* and θύραζε).

²⁶ Plut. *Cato M.* 18, 5 (347): ὁ τοῦ πλούτου ζήλος ... ἐκ τῆς ὀχλῶδου καὶ θυραίου δόξης ἐπιεσώδιος; *De recta rat. aud.* 38D (impulses towards pleasure and suspicions towards suffering) οὐ θυραίους οὐδ’ ὑπὸ λόγων ἐπεισάκτους, ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ αὐτόχθονας...; cf. *Quomodo adulator*... 65F: τοῖς θυραίοις κόλαξιν; *De frat. amore* 479A; Themist. *Orat.* p. 187a; 319b Hardouin; lambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 32, 227 (‘profane’); Eustratius in *Aristotelis EN* (Comm. in *Arist. Gr.*, 20) 21, 9; 39, 2; 85, 8; 96, 9; etc.

²⁷ Leo 1905, 606; Harrauer/Römer 1985, 356 n. 18 (“Nach Du Cange s.v. ist diese Bedeutung erst im Mittelalter nachweisbar”); Nisbet 2001, 24; Harrison/Winterbottom 2001, 14; Tilg 2007, 170; 2014, 32–33 (cf. n. 36 below) etc.

²⁸ It is noteworthy that Apuleian hapax legomena are sometimes included in the dictionary of Du Cange.

edly Apuleian words and usages that were considered ‘vulgar’ (whatever this vague term might stand for). I then used the *ThLL* to sift this list, leaving only those words used in the “Metamorphoses” and dismissing any that came into writing before Apuleius, or in the 2nd and 3rd centuries (apart from *Itala* and *Vulgata*).²⁹ Those words unique to Apuleius were also removed. Eventually I came up with the following list:

- alumnare:** *Met.* 10, 23; 6, 23; 8, 17; 9, 36; *Mart. Cap. (saec. V)* 8, 813; 9, 982.
- busequa:** *Met.* 8, 1; *Gloss. V*, 657, 10 *busequa: boum provisor*; *Sidon. (fere 431–486) Epist.* 1, 6, 3.
- campensis:** *Met.* 9, 26; *Itala Deut.* 4:49, *Luc.* 6:17; subst. *Optatus, Appendix decem monum.* 1 p. 196, 17 (**saec. IV ex., inter 330 et 347 collecta**); *Hieron. (fere 347–420) Epist.* 15, 3, 5.
- cavillus (-um)** pro *cavilla*: *Met.* 1, 7; 2, 19; *CGL; Festus*; *Aug. c. Iul. opus imperf.* 3, 50 (**429–430**); *Ps. Aur. Victor Epit. (fere 360/400?)* 9, 14; 23, 6; *Prud. (*348) Lib. peristephanon* 2, 318.
- decoriter:** *Met.* 5, 22; 6, 28; 11, 4; *Iul. Val. Ps. Callisth. Hist. Alex. Magni (saec. IV¹)* 1, 24.
- depudescere** (*Gloss.* depuduit ἀπηναισχύντησεν) *Met.* 10, 29; *Aug. Conf. (fere 400)* 8, 2, 4.
- discretim:** *Met.* 6, 1; *Hil. in Psalm.* 138, 23 p. 760, 1 (**post 360, ante 367**); *Amm. (saec. IV²)* 28, 1, 36; 29, 6, 13; *Cypr. Gall. Genesis* 345 (**saec. V in.**).
- disternere:** *Met.* 10, 34, 17 *disternebatur torus*; 2, 15, 2 *distratum fuerat* (ὀπείστροτο *Lucian.*); *Comm. not. Tiron. (aetate Carolinorum in hanc formam redacti)* 54, 87 etc.
- exobruere** (~ ‘effodere’) *Met.* 9, 6; *Itala Prov.* 29:22; *Andidotaria Bruxell. (saec. VI?) frg. phys.* p. 397, 6; *Cassiod. (saec. VI med.) Hist.* 5, 31 p. 1108C.
- furatrina** (‘furtum’): *Met.* 6, 13; 8, 3; 10, 14; *Iul. Val. Ps. Callisth. Hist. Alex. Magni (saec. IV¹)* 2, 26.
- hauritus part. pro haustus:** *Met.* 2, 15 (supinum); 3, 24; 6, 14; *hauriturus* *Iuven.* 2, 251 (**fere 330**); *Dracont. (saec. V ex.) Romul.* 2, 124.
- impaenitendus:** *Met.* 11, 28; *Itala 2 Cor.* 7:10, *Aug. (354–430) Serm.* 254, 22; *Cassiod. (saec. VI med.) Var. praef.* 3; 1, 30, 4.
- incoram:** *Met.* 9, 42 (adv.); *Symm. (saec. IV²) Epist.* 9, 129.
- inescare** ‘cibare, alere’: *Met.* 7, 14 *cenae reliquiis ... canes inescatos atque distentos*; 10, 15 *liberalibus cenis inescatus*; 9, 24 *odore sulphuris iuvenis inescatus*; *Auspicius Tullensis ad Abrog. (fere 475) quam scintillam si forte inescaveris ... flagrabat* – maybe, also *Amm. Marc. (saec. IV²)* 30, 4, 20 *sellulariis quaestibus inescati*.³⁰
- infimare:** *Met.* 1, 8; *Mart. Cap. (saec. V)* 8, 849; 6, 595.
- intrimentum:** *Met.* 10, 13, 3; *Zeno episc. Veronensis († ante 380)* 2, 36.
- iubilatio** - *agrestium:* *Met.* 8, 17, 2 *canes rabidos ... iubilationibus solitis ... inhortantur*; *Itala Psalm.* 26:6 et saepius; *Petr. Chrys. († fere 450) Serm.* 6 p. 202^B *oves ad pascua dulcedo iubilationis invitat*;
- *gaudentium et al.:* *Paul. Nol. (fere 353–441) Epist.* 13, 14 p. 95, 19; *Cassianus (360–435?) Conlationes* 21, 26, 2 al.; *Cassiod. (saec. VI med.) in Psalm.* 25:8; *Prosper Tiro Aquitanus Expos. in Psalm.* 150:5 (**440/450**); *Ambros. De excessu fratris Satyri (378)* 2, 110 l. 8; *Rufin. (345–410) Origen. in Ios.* 7:2 p. 329, 2, 25; *Aug. (354–430) in Psalm.* 32:2; *Serm.* 1, 8 l. 26, 28; 46 et saepius; *Greg. Magnus Moral. (ante 590)* 8, 89; *Theod. Mopsuestenis (episc. 392–428) Epit. in Psalm.* 32:3^B etc.; *Bachiarus (saec. V in.) De reparatione lapsi* 1 p. 1037B.
- lorus** (masc.): *Met.* 3, 13, 4; 14, 2; *Petr.* 57, 8 (in sermone liberti); *Schol. in Iuv.* 6, 480 (**fere 400 in corpus redacta**); *CGL II* 286, 7; 332, 10; *Comm. not. Tiron. (aetate Carolinorum in hanc formam redacti)* 99, 24.

²⁹ The datings are taken from the *ThLL-Index* (some of them may, of course, be controversial).

³⁰ *ThLL* s.v.: ‘illicere’, but Seyfarth 1971, 217 translates “...nachdem sie durch ihren Stubenhocker-erwerb ihren Magen gefüllt haben.”

minare ('pellere, agere pecus', cf. ἐλάω):³¹ *Met.* 8, 30, 4 *me ... gladiis minantes*; 3, 28, 6 *nos duos asinos et equum ... minantes baculis exigunt*;³² *Vulg.*; *Itala*; *Avien. Arat.* (**saec. IV, ante 386**) 259 (*Arat.* 92 ἐλάοντι); *Schol. in Iuv.* 6, 526 (**ferre 400 in corpus redacta**); *Cypr. Gall.* (**saec. V in.**) *Exod.* 737; *Pallad. Hist. monach.* (**saec. V**) 1, 5 p. 226^D (gr. ἐλαύνον); *Greg. M. Dial.* (**593**) 1, 2 p. 21, 2 M.

pressim: *Met.* 2, 16, 2; 30, 9; *Iul. Vict.* (**saec. IV?**) *Ars rhet.* p. 97, 3.

pulposus: *Met.* 7, 16; *Donat.* (**saec. IV**) in *Ter. Hec.* 441; *Hippocr. De victu* (**versio lat. saec. VI?**) 37 p. 200; *Sorani Gynaecia* (**versio lat. saec. VI?**) p. 7, 12; p. 9, 14 Rose.

Some further examples might also be disputed:

(?) **attiguus**: *Met.* 4, 3; 4, 12; 4, 28; 6, 12; *Avien. Arat.* 241 (**saec. IV, ante 386**), *Orb. terr.* 1151; *Paul. Nol.* (**ferre 353–441**) *Carm.* 15, 291; 16, 158; 27, 454; 21, 384; *Epist.* 31, 4 p. 272; *Sulp. Sev.* (**ferre 363–420**) *Dial.* 1, 13, 8; *Agenn. Urbicus grom.* (**saec. IV–V?**) p. 81 – but the word is also attested in the text that manuscripts attribute to *Frontinus grom.* [**saec. I/II**] p. 11.

(?) **capillitium**: *Met.* 2, 2; *Mart. Cap.* (**saec. V**) 2, 281; 4, 331 – but it is also found in the manuscripts of *Cels.* 4, 2 (**saec. I**) *partem quae capillitio tegitur* [*capillo* Vat. cod. et edd.].

(?) **intus + gen.** (cf. Gr. ἐντός): *Met.* 8, 29, 6 *intus aedium*; *Greg. Antiochen. De baptismo Christi* 2 (**saec. VI**) – it occurs also in *Sen. Herc. f.* 679 *intus immensi sinus* [v.l. *immenso sinu*] *placido quieta labitur Lethe vado*, where most scholars refuse to accept such a Grecism;³³

(?) **linteamen**: *Met.* 11, 10, 2; *Itala Apoc.* 15:6; *Vulg. Is.* 3:22 – later on the word is frequent in 4th–6th centuries, but is also attested earlier in an inscription (*Notiz. d. scavi* 1913, p. 311 {a. 231}) and a papyrus (*PapCorp* 254, 11 {**saec. II in.**}).

Importantly, this list includes only examples from the “Metamorphoses” (“Florida” and “Apologia” would add to this amount), only up to the letter P, and only from Rönsch. Still, the list is long enough, and at times the chronological gap even exceeds two centuries (part. *hauritus*, *exobruere*).

Of course, not all lexemes cited here are equally relevant to the discussion. Some of them may turn out to be unattested archaisms;³⁴ others are notable purely for their morphological deviations (*decoriter*, *discretim*, *pressim*, *incoram*, part. *hauritus*), gender fluctuation (*lorus*, *cavillus*) or changes in syntax (*intus + gen.*). Some are simply new words for objects of everyday life that entered the literary language later (*linteamen*, *intrimentum*). Grecisms like *depudescere* or *intus + gen.* are more significant.

More important parallels to the typical use of *forensis* as ‘foreign’ are the locutions of late (one would not hesitate to say vulgar) Latin with semantic development:

- *inescare* in the sense of ‘to satiate, saturate’ instead of ‘to decoy’ (*esca* denoting simply ‘food’ instead of ‘bait’);
- *iubilatio*, particularly in the sense of ‘sounds for driving animals’;

³¹ Cf. impersonal passive in *Colum.* 7, 3, 26 *in agendis ovibus ... acclamatione ac baculo minetur*.

³² If it were not for the previous example, one might interpret *minantes* in its normal sense ‘to threaten’, the object depending not on *minantes*, but on *exigunt*.

³³ For various interpretations see *Billerbeck* 1999, 429–430 with literature.

³⁴ For example, *aviditer* is found both in *Met.* 4, 7 and in *Gloss. Placid.* V, 7, 19 and in *Arnob. nat.* 5, 1. However, *Arnobius* retells a story from *Valerius Antias*, and it is possible that *aviditer* dates back to the latter. On these grounds one could suspect similar words, like *decoriter*, to be archaisms as well. *Discretim* and *pressim* may have occurred in *Sisenna*, who is known to favour adverbs in *-im*. Given the *Sidonius*’ proneness to mannerism, one might suspect an archaism in *busequa*; and so on.

- active transitive *minare* in the sense of ‘to drive (cattle)’;
- *exobruere* ‘to dig out’ (where prefix *ob-* seems to lose its semantics).

In some cases, Apuleian words that frequently occur in the late Latin (the 4th century and onwards), are only found once or twice in the 2nd and 3rd centuries (apart from *Italia*), which might be considered a matter of coincidence. For example, *proximare* ‘come near, approximate (of persons)’ appears to be no less harsh a vulgarism than *forensis* in the sense of ‘foreign’. Apuleius and *Vulgata* aside, it is found once in Solinus (5, 21; cf. 5, 23 *proximant*, v.l. *proximi*) and once in Ps.-Cyprianic “De singularitate clericorum” (both are dated to the 3rd or 4th century). Yet further examples date from the close of the 4th century.³⁵

To sum up, the fact that *forensis* as ‘foreign’ is only found two centuries after Apuleius should give no reason for concern at all.

5. Conclusion

Since the sense of ‘foreign’ fits the direct context of the passage perfectly, we have no reason to reject it: expressions of late and vulgar Latin (from the end of the 4th century or even later) are common for the vocabulary of the “Metamorphoses”. The meaning ‘external’ (derived from *foris* / *foras* or by analogy with Greek θυραῖος) has been attested in Columella. Moreover, it is very likely that *forensis* is used to mean ‘foreign’ in *Met.* 4, 13, 6. In view of these advantages it seems forced and far-fetched to insist upon any connections between Lucius’ speech and the forum: however ingeniously these might be defended, they do not fit the direct context, which makes no allusions or reference to the forum.

The influential studies of Tilg (2007, 169–172; 2014, 32–35) and Keulen (2007a, 120–132; 2007b, 9; 85) while accepting the sense of ‘foreign’,³⁶ insist that here *forensis* also refers to the Roman forum. They combine the solutions to clarify the perplexing sentence which follows. Without discussing their interpretation of the whole passage in detail, it is clear that both scholars interpret *immutatio vocis* to be referring not to the language, but to the style that deviates from that of the Roman forum,³⁷ which sets, in their view, a general standard of Roman eloquence and prose composition.

The interpretation of *immutatio vocis* and the passage which follows is an open question. Yet whatever the solution, it would be far-fetched to retrieve the idea of the forum out of *forensis* and to equate it with standard Latin prose as opposed to the (Greek) mannerisms of Apuleius. This is particularly so, considering the coordinate *exoticus*, which, as Tilg (2007, 160) admits, “is not easy to understand as referring to style”. Furthermore, it would clearly overcomplicate things to insist upon not the primary, but the background meaning of *forensis* with this peculiar conception of the forum as the substitute for Ro-

³⁵ With the exclusion of the participle in Censor. 8, 6 *proximantia sibimet zodia*; in Cic. ND 2, 112 *proximat* is usually regarded as corrupt.

³⁶ In Tilg’s opinion (2014, 32–33), the meaning ‘foreign’ is “perhaps even coined by Apuleius in this very passage”. In view of the numerous vulgarisms from the “Metamorphoses” discussed above, I can see no grounds for this assumption.

³⁷ Keulen 2007a, 124–128; 2007b, 88, in the footsteps of Harrauer/Römer 1985, 357–361, interprets *vocis immutatio* as ‘modulation of voice’ during a rhetorical performance, with reference to *vocis mutationes* in Cic. *Orat.* 55 and Quintil. 11, 3, 183; Tilg 2007, 175–179 – as one of categories of change (also called *immutatio*) used by ancient grammarians. *Forensis* was explained as pointing at stylistic standards (of the forum), from which Apuleius pointedly deviates, as early as by Sittl 1889, 559 (very succinctly).

man prose (from which the narrator allegedly deviates). Once *exoticus ac forensis sermo* is understood as ‘imported and foreign talk’ (whether it refers to non-native language or to literary performance — in my opinion, a far less plausible idea), — it would make it difficult for the reader to reinterpret *forensis* later in its other meaning and grasp its allusion to the concept of traditional Roman prose (this allusion itself being far from evident, despite protracted argumentations of Tilg and Keulen). In short, to interpret *forensis* in both senses at once is to serve two masters.

I shall refrain from concluding that since *forensis* means only ‘foreign’ here, the words *iam haec equidem ipsa vocis immutatio* necessarily imply the change of language from Greek to Latin. It was commonly accepted earlier³⁸ and seems most natural to me, yet admittedly it is somewhat harsh to separate *haec ipsa vocis immutatio* from the reference to possible blunders of language (or style) that immediately precedes it, and to link it with the earlier sentence *mox in urbe Latia ... excolui*. Still, one should not sacrifice the obvious and natural meaning of *exoticus ac forensis sermo* for the benefit of the line of interpretation that has little support in the text of the prologue itself.³⁹ Charging single words with ambiguity and overelaborate conceptions will inevitably result in reading too much out of too little.

Dubuisson 2000, 611–613 suggests that *forensis* was added by the narrator in order to correct the word *exoticus* that was regarded as a Grecism. He goes as far as to call it “glossing” and translate: “une langue exotique — pardon, l’étrangère”). In his opinion, the words *immutatio vocis* refer to this very correction of a Greek word by the proper Latin one.⁴⁰ Yet, tempting as it might seem to link the *exoticus ac forensis sermo* with subsequent *immutatio vocis* and *fabula Graecanica*, this interpretation does not easily agree with the coordinate conjunction: *ac* is too far from “pardon...”, and the idea of “glossing” here seems forced.

Nor is it likely that *forensis* is a deliberate solecism playfully chosen by Apuleius for the very sentence in which the speaker apologizes for defects of language (or style). As we have seen, vulgar and late Latin words occur throughout the “Metamorphoses”. In calling Latin *exoticus ac forensis sermo* Apuleius may have been guided by mere manneristic concern to avoid common words, such as, for example, *alienus* or *peregrinus*.

References

- Adlington W. (tr., 1566), Gaselee, S. (ed., transl., rev.) Apuleius, *The Golden Ass, Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius*. London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1915.
 Armini H. Till diskussionen om Apuleiustexten. *Eranos* 1932, 30, 49–92.
 Augello G. (ed., transl., comm.). *Metamorfosi o Asino d’oro di Lucio Apuleio*. Turin 21980.

³⁸ See Harrauer/Römer 1985, 354–356.

³⁹ Even more perplexing than *vocis immutatio* is its connection with *desultoria scientia* and the meaning of the latter. I incline to side with Bürger 1888, 492–493 and Norden 1918, 603–604 n. 5 followed by Bernhard 1927, 258 n. 4 and Scobie 1975, 75, who refer the metaphor of equestrian vaulting to inserted tales, as though the narrator were suddenly jumping from one story to another “at full tilt” (Norden cites the title of Varro *Men.* 85–86 B *Desultorius*, περί τοῦ γράφειν [περιτυραφειν et περιτουτ(τ)ραφειν codd., περί τοῦ τρέφειν Cèbe] and Sisenna *Hist.* 127 P *vellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo*). However, I admit that the point of comparison between the two in this case is rather vague, being no more than the idea of sudden shifting: the narrator has to switch from Greek to Latin just as he will be switching from one story to another in sewing together various stories (*sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram*, 1, 1, 1).

⁴⁰ Dubuisson 2000, 611 confers the text of Columella 12 praef. 4 quoted above, where vice versa *forensis* was explained with the help of *extraneus*.

- Bernhard M. *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura. Ein Beitrag zur Stilistik des Spätlateins*. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1927.
- Billerbeck M. (ed., transl., comm.). *Seneca, Hercules furens*. Leiden, Brill, 1999.
- Bürger K. Zu Apuleius. *Hermes* 1888, 23, 489–498.
- Dowden K. Prologic, Predecessors, and Prohibitions, in: Kahane, Laird, 2001, 123–136.
- Dubuisson M. Art de la voltige et 'code-switching' (Apulée, "Métamorphoses" I, 1, 5–6). *Latomus* 2000, 59(3) 607–613.
- Ernout A., Meillet A. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latin*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, ³1951.
- Fick-Michel N. *Art et mystique dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée*, Paris, Les Belles-Lettres, 1991.
- Forster E. S., Heffner E. H. (eds, transl.). *Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella. On Agriculture, Volume III: Books 10–12. On Trees*. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, ²1968.
- Grimal P. (transl.). *Romans grecs et latins*, Bibl. de la Pléiade 134. Paris, Gallimard, 1958.
- Hanson J. A. (ed., transl.) *Apuleius, Metamorphoses*. Vol. I. Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard Univ. Press, 1989.
- Harrauer Chr., Römer F. Beobachtungen zum Metamorphosen-Prolog des Apuleius. *Mnemosyne* 1985, 38, 353–372.
- Harrison S. J. The Speaking Book: The Prologue to Apuleius' Metamorphoses. *CIQ* 1990, 40, 507–513.
- Harrison S., Winterbottom M. The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*: Text, Translation, and Textual Commentary, in: Kahane, Laird, 2001, 9–15.
- Hedberg St. (ed.) [*L. Iuni Moderati Columellae*] *Rei rusticae liber XII*. Uppsala, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1968.
- Helm R. (ed.) *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1907 (²1913, ³1931=1955).
- Helm R. (ed., transl.) *Apuleius, Metamorphosen oder Der goldene Esel*. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, ²1956.
- Hijmans B. L., a.o. (eds, transl., comm.) *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses, Book IV, 1–27*. Groningen, Bouma's Boekhuis B. V., 1977.
- Kahane A., Laird A. (eds) *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses*. Oxford, Univ. Press, 2001.
- Kenney E. J. (ed., transl., comm.) *Apuleius, Cupid and Psyche*, Cambridge, Univ. Press, 1990.
- Keulen W. *Vocis immutatio*: The Apuleian Prologue and the Pleasures and Pitfalls of Vocal Versatility, in: Rimell V. (ed.). *Seeing tongues, hearing scripts: orality and representation in the ancient novel*. Eelde, Barkhuis, 2007a, 106–137.
- Keulen W. (ed., transl., comm.) *Apuleius, Metamorphoses, Book I*. Groningen, Egbert Forsten, 2007b.
- Korenjak M. Eine Bemerkung zum Metamorphosenprolog des Apuleius. *RhM* 1997, 140, 328–332.
- Leo F. Coniectanea. *Hermes* 1905, 606–613.
- May R. (ed., transl., comm.) *Apuleius, Metamorphoses, Book 1*. Oxford, Oxbow Books, 2013.
- Molt M. (comm.) *Ad Apulei Madaurensis Metamorphoseon librum primum commentarius exegeticus*. Groningen, M. de Waal, 1938.
- Münstermann H. *Apuleius. Metamorphosen literarischer Vorlagen*. Stuttgart, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1995.
- Nisbet R. G. M. Cola und Clausulae in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1. 1, in: Kahane, Laird, 2001, 16–26.
- Norden E. *Die antike Kunstprosa*. Vol. 2. Leipzig, Berlin, B. G. Teubner, ³1918.
- Oldfather W. A., Canter H. V., Perry B. E. *Index Apuleianus*, Middletown (Conn.), American Philological Association, 1934.
- Powell J. G. F. Some Linguistic Points in the Prologue, in: Kahane, Laird, 2001, 27–36.
- Rönsch H. *Itala und Vulgata: Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata unter Berücksichtigung der römischen Volkssprache durch Beispiele erläutert*. Marburg, N. G. Elwert, 1875.
- Scobie A. (comm.) *Apuleius Metamorphoses (Asinus Aureus) I: A Commentary*. Meisenheim am Glan, Anton Hain, 1975. (comm. 1975, 'reminiscent of the market-place'),
- Seyfarth W. (ed., transl.) *Ammianus Marcellinus, Römische Geschichte*. 4. Teil, Buch 26–31. Berlin, Akademie-Verlag 1971.
- Shanzer D. *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella's De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book I*. Berkeley (Calif.), Univ. of California Press, 1986.
- Sittl K. Apuleius über seinen Stil. *ALL* 1889, 6, 558–559.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae: Index librorum, scriptorum, inscriptionum ex quibus exempla afferuntur*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, ²1990.
- Tilg St. *Apuleius' Metamorphoses: A Study in Roman Fiction*. Oxford, Univ. Press, 2014.
- Tilg St. Lucius on Poetics? The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* Reconsidered. *SIFC* 2007, 5, 156–198.
- Valette P. (transl.), Robertson D. S. (ed.) *Apulée, Les Métamorphoses*. Vol. I. Paris, Les Belles-Lettres, 1940.

Van der Vliet J (ed.). *Lucii Apulei Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1897a.
Van der Vliet J. Die Vorrede der Apuleischen Metamorphosen. *Hermes* 1897b, 32, 79–85.
Winkler J.J. *Auctor and Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' "The Golden Ass"*. Berkeley (Calif.), Univ. of California Press, 1985.

For citation: Denis V. Keyer. Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 1, 1, 5 *forensis*: 'foreign' or 'of the forum'? *Philologia Classica* 2017, 12(1), 35–47. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2017.105.

**АПУЛЕЙ, «МЕТАМОРФОЗЫ», 1, 1, 5 *FORENSIS*:
'ИНОСТРАННЫЙ' ИЛИ 'ОТНОСЯЩИЙСЯ К ФОРУМУ'?**

Денис Валерьевич Кейер

Санкт-Петербургский институт истории РАН, Российская Федерация,
197110, Санкт-Петербург, Петрозаводская ул., 7; keyer@mail.ru

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, Российская Федерация,
199034, Санкт-Петербург, Университетская наб., 7–9; keyer@mail.ru

В пассаже из пролога к «Метаморфозам» Апулея *exotici ac forensi<s> sermonis* (1, 1, 5) слово *forensis* означает не 'относящийся к форуму', а 'иностранный'. Именно последнее значение предполагается контекстом: два однородных прилагательных, соединенные союзом *ac*, должны характеризовать предмет с одинаковой стороны. Аргументы, выдвигавшиеся против значения 'иностранный', несостоятельны: (1) в остальных случаях *forensis* у Апулея указывает на форум — но в пассаже *Met.* 4, 13, 6 Г. Армини убедительно защитил рукописное *forensis* в значении 'иностранный'; (2) значение 'иностранный' засвидетельствовано лишь начиная с конца IV в. н.э. — но в «Метаморфозах» много лексем, которые впервые засвидетельствованы у Апулея, а затем — в IV в. н.э. или позже; (3) словообразовательная модель, возводящая *forensis* к *foris*, предполагает грубое просторечие — но в смысле «находящийся вне дома» это прилагательное встречается у Колумеллы (12 praef. 4). Недавние попытки истолковать это слово в обоих значениях одновременно малоубедительны: идея «стиля римского форума», от которого будто бы отступает повествователь, представляется натянутой, и эту сложную концепцию невозможно вычитать из простой и ясной пары синонимов: «заграничный и иностранный». Библиогр. 45 назв.

Ключевые слова: Апулей, Метаморфозы, пролог, поздняя латынь, *forensis*.

Received 24.03.2017

Final version received 26.05.2017